



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,020	05/03/2001	Raymond E. Craft	GRD0135.US	5708

7590 09/10/2003

Todd T. Taylor
TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.
142 S. Main St.
P.O. Box 560
Avilla, IN 46710

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

VU, STEPHEN A

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3636

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Sw

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,020	CRAFT ET AL.
	Examiner Stephen A Vu	Art Unit 3636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 19 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hand et al (#5,902,011) in view of Nissen and Colasanti et al.

Hand et al (#5,902,011) show an article of furniture comprising a support (22) having a support surface, a flexible support member (30) having a plate structure, a plurality of air bladders (24), at least one fluid line coupling the air bladders together, and a single valve (34) fluidly coupled with at least one fluid line. However, Hand et al do not disclose that the air bladder has an expandable foam and the support member has outwardly extending opposed projections connecting to the support surface.

Nissen teaches a seat cushion comprising an open-celled compressible foam material. The cushion is self-inflating when the valve is open. A user can deflate the

cushion and then close the valve to prevent further inflation of the cushion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the bladders of Hand et al by enabling the bladders to have an expanded foam material to be self-inflating by an open valve, and then closing the valve to prevent further inflation as taught by Nissen. This modification would facilitate the process of inflating and deflating the bladders to accommodate a user's back.

Furthermore, Colasanti et al teach a lumbar support comprising a support (20) having a support surface and a flexible support member (42) having a plurality of outwardly extending projections (54,56) being of upper and lower segments. The upper and lower segments are connected to the support surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the support member of Hand et al's invention with extending projections as taught by Colasanti et al, in order to securely attach the support member to the support surface of the support.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 19 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Remarks

The examiner has reviewed and considered the applicant's comments in the Amendment, filed on August 1, 2003. Based on an updated search, the examiner has decided to issue a new ground of rejection. Accordingly, this Office action is considered to be Non-final.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chiba et al is cited as showing similar types of support.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen A Vu whose telephone number is 703-308-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M Cuomo can be reached on 703-308-0827. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.


Peter M. Cuomo
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3600



Stephen Vu
September 2, 2003